

OBSERVATIONS
ON
PHRENOLOGY,

BEING THE SUBSTANCE OF

A LECTURE

DELIVERED TO THE

HULL LITERARY AND PHILOSOPHICAL SOCIETY,

BY

GEORGE HUNSLEY FIELDING, M. D.

MEMBER OF THE ROYAL COLLEGE OF SURGEONS IN LONDON; MEMBER OF
THE BRITISH ASSOCIATION FOR THE ADVANCEMENT OF SCIENCE, &c. &c.

— Ridentem dicere verum
Quid vetat ?

HORACE.

HULL:

PUBLISHED BY R. T. CUSSONS, LOWGATE;
AND SOLD BY RIVINGTONS, WATERLOO-PLACE, PALL-MALL, LONDON.

[PRICE ONE SHILLING.]

~~~~~  
John Hutchinson, Printer, 30, Seale-Lane, Hull.

R35576

TO

RALPH BERNAL, Esq., M. P.

&c. &c. &c.

---

MY DEAR SIR,

As one of the oldest and most esteemed, as well as most distinguished, friends of the family to which I am allied, it gives me the greatest pleasure and gratification to dedicate this little work to you. I am fully aware that its imperfections will at once be apparent to your critical and discerning eye, but I feel equally as confident that your well-known kindness and goodness of heart will as promptly excuse them.

With best wishes for your continued health and prosperity,

I have the honour to be,

My dear Sir,

Your sincerely attached, and obedient humble Servant,

THE AUTHOR.

*Albion-Street, Hull,*

*June 8, 1840*



## PREFACE.

---

It is now many years since the following little Essay was read before the Hull Literary and Philosophical Society. At that time the subject was, comparatively speaking, new, and consequently excited a good deal of interest, and the debate which ensued was very warm and protracted during four subsequent evenings. Notwithstanding the mighty "march of intellect" since that time, phrenology still survives; and there is now, as then, a "*genus irritabile*," whose "quills do stand on end" the moment a syllable is dropped against their darling day dream.

I have frequently been asked to publish this Essay, and for several reasons have at length resolved to do so. Experience has but served to confirm the opinion I then entertained, that ridicule (though perhaps not always a just test of truth) was the best if not the only available way of treating the subject of Phrenology. Argument is totally impracticable with its proselytes, as there are so many convenient little loop-holes for escape, that it is impossible to fix them to a point.

That these remarks may serve to amuse, if they do not instruct, and perchance drive away a few of the cob-webs that will gather in the brains of even the best and wisest of us, is the utmost wish of

THE AUTHOR.



## ON PHRENOLOGY.

---

THE taste for the marvellous appears to be as much in fashion at the present time, and to constitute equally as principal a source of amusement to the good people of England, as ever it did, even in the days of the merry bard of Avon. His satire on our credulity in this point of view is, therefore, still as keenly pointed as ever.

“ Had I but this fish painted now in England, I would make a show of it; not a holiday fool but would give a piece of silver; any strange beast there makes a man; when they will not give a doit to relieve a blind beggar, they will lay out ten to see a dead Indian.”

We have in these enlightened days our shows and sights of mermaids, (which, by the bye, I hope shortly to hear satisfactorily proved to be common as eoral on the Indian Coast,) our shows of marvellous fishes, sea serpents, sheep with two heads, ealves with six legs and two bodies, huge overgrown oxen, giants, fat ehildren, &c. &c. but to eclipse the glory of all past wonders, and establish our fame as paramount, in the annals of future ages, a boy has been shewn about the country, with his name and the date of his birth written in his eyes\*!

\* This boy, whose name I think was James Wood, was shewn about the country as a remarkable evidence of Divine interposition. His father had sworn that unless he was born with his name in his eyes, he would never believe him to be his own son, or acknowledge him as such. To save his mother's reputation and legitimize the boy, it was found, soon after the child was born, that on the iris of one eye his father's name was written, and on the other the date of the child's birth. I had not faith enough I suppose, so I could not distinguish a letter or figure in either eye, but a servant of mine (who I afterwards found could not read) saw them perfectly distinctly. About the same time a child was shewn in Paris with Napoleon Empereur in its eyes, and the French Scavans were said to have thought the irides must have been tattooed!

The same rage for the marvellous appears also to pervade the paths of Literature:—not contented with the beautiful and varied works of fiction which are almost daily poured from the press, from the glowing and seemingly inexhaustible pen of the Great Unknown, and numberless others of our own countrymen, we are actually inundated with the wild horrors and fanciful imagery of other nations. From the Germans, in particular, vast quantities of extravagant fictions have lately been borrowed, and, amongst other proofs of the activity of their imaginative faculties, we are indebted to them for the *Legend of Bumps*, by Dr. Gall.

Here we have, certainly, ample cause to admire the ingenuity of man. Three times, prior to the present, has this *new* and *wonderful* Theory been presented, in different garbs, to the public: thrice has it perished with ephemeral fame, and thrice, phoenix-like, a fresh Theory has arisen from the ashes\*.

Be its doctrines new or old, true or false, Craniology has now, Gentlemen, attracted no inconsiderable share of attention in the world. It has met with encouragement from many men of letters, because they are ever on the watch to promote the interests of science, and forward every step towards her improvement; it has met with encouragement from others on account of the peculiarity of its views in Metaphysics; but it has met with encourage-

\* In the 13th century, Albertus Magnus constructed a wooden image of a man, fitting it with springs and contrivances for motion and sound; and mapped out upon the head the various faculties and dispositions of mind, regarding the head as the seat of mind, and those divisions as its manifestations; the second is a Latin Treatise, published Venice, March 28, 1500, by Johannes de Retha. Here even the terminations are the same as in the modern one, for he speaks of *cellula imaginativa*, *estimativa*, *cogitativa*, *memorativa*, &c. &c. In 1784, John Godfrey Herder anticipated many of the modern speculations. Martinus Scriblerus and Emanuel Swedenborg might also perhaps be named as having discussed the same subject to a certain extent.



ment from the majority of its followers (amongst whom I fear I must be so ungallant as to class those of the fair sex who are enrolled under its banners) from the specious attractions it holds forth, and the all-powerful charm of novelty. Whether it be worthy of the attention which has been paid to it, remains, with us at least, to be proved. Like all other human pursuits, it has had to encounter opposition, even in the bud; and had it not been for the violent and outrageous conduct of the court of Vienna, at the outset of Dr. Gall to promulgate his system, it is more than probable that his luminous lucubrations would, long ere this, have descended to the tomb of the Capulets, and perhaps never have reached their present darling nursery, Edina. But, thus it always has been and ever will be, persecution never fails to increase the thing it vainly hopes and strives to crush.

My principal reason for selecting the subject, and presenting it to your attention this evening, is to promote free discussion. All here have had the opportunity of hearing the exceedingly able, eloquent, and most ingenious Lectures which were delivered in this town a short time since by Dr. Allen, and, independently of that circumstance, are no doubt perfectly well acquainted with the subject; for as Mr. Jeffrey says—Who has not heard of Craniology? of Dr. Gall and his plaster casts and mapped skulls? Presuming this, it will be totally unnecessary to trespass on your time by entering at large into a detail of the whole modern rise and progress of the science, and equally so to recount the thirty-two, or more, bumps or organs with which our unlucky skulls have been studded, and as it were mac-adamized, together with their various uses and applications. All this is, of course, sufficiently familiar to you, and I shall merely attempt to shew the errors of the basis on which this soi-disant science of Phrenology is founded. Let us first ask ourselves, What is Phrenology?

The science of Phrenology, Craniology, Craniscopy—aut quocunque alio nomine gaudet—is stated to be a beautiful system of mental philosophy, possessing the peculiar power and advantage of enabling us to discover, by the simple inspection of the skull of any individual, the extent of his animal propensities and of his intellectual powers, and moreover to ascertain the particular bent of his mind and disposition.

The foundations on which this portentous structure is erected are as follows: the brain is the seat of the soul, the material organ of the mind. The mind manifests a plurality of faculties and propensities, and if these are not in the brain, where are they? therefore, they are in the brain! All the faculties and propensities possess, severally, a distinct and demonstrable portion of brain, as a local habitation. According to the size and vigour of these portions of brain, or, (as they are termed, organs of the faculties and propensities) will the activity and predominance of those faculties or propensities be in the individual. As a logical deduction from these premises, it is inferred that the mental qualities of a man are in an exact ratio with the quantity of his brains. and of course with the size of his head.

The brain is perfected long before the ossification of the skull is complete, and consequently must influence its shape; therefore the internal surface of the skull will present an exact mould of the shape of the brain and its organs: now the internal and external tables of the skull exactly correspond in their depressions and elevations; ergo, the external skull will demonstrate clearly the shape of the brain, and its bumps denote the situation of the aforesaid faculties and propensities.

This, Gentlemen, is logical deduction! this, Gentlemen, is the basis of a science which is to set aside all the puerile notions of such men as Hume, as Locke, as Hartley, as

Reid, as Brown, as Stewart! No wonder Mr. Coombe should so gravely assert in the outset of his certainly eloquent and erudite work that "Phrenology is the greatest and most important discovery ever communicated to mankind." If all be true, that the Phrenologists advance as such, the science is, undoubtedly, of inestimable value, and its proselytes are inexcusable in not having, long ere this, turned their knowledge into some useful channel, for the benefit of the present and of future generations.

We all know, that in early childhood, the head is imperfectly ossified, and from the example of some Indian and American tribes it is clearly shewn that it is possible to mould the skull into a particular shape by the simple application of pressure. Now, the Phrenologists know the situation of all the different sentiments, faculties, and propensities of the mind, and it is but fair to suppose they might take advantage of this pliability of the skull to mould it to any given shape. They might eradicate the evil and cherish the good propensities of our nature, by applying pressure on the former, and leaving ample room for the latter to expand. If this system were once brought into fashion we should soon no longer have to mourn over the melancholy and yearly increase in the catalogue of human crimes, and, in process of time, honesty might be so much *pushed* into fashion, that, like the inhabitants of the Pelew Islands, we should require neither locks to our doors nor keys to our treasures.

The late establishment of Infant Schools in various parts of this nursery of intellect, Great Britain, is a most favourable opportunity for the commencement of such a philanthropic scheme. Each Infant School should certainly have a Phrenological master, or Inspector-General of skulls, "to teach the young idea how to shoot." A graduated set of caps, made of steel or iron, should be constructed on the unerring principles of Phrenology, for the

purpose of applying pressure and shaping, or moulding the youngsters heads to some standard of perfection, in the department of life they were destined to pursue. How easy, for instance, would it be, to create a poet, in spite of Horace's foolish dogma.

Poeta nascitur non fit.

(Though be it remembered, Horace was not skilled in Phrenology.)—We should leave unlimited space for the expansion of the organ of ideality, ample room for love of approbation, for hope, (without which no poet could possibly exist) and, lastly, for veneration—for his patron. Statesmen, physicians, lawyers, or clergymen might just as easily be created by altering the mode of pressure according to the organs you wished to be most prominent.

We ought not absolutely to *despair* of curing *grown sinners* in desperate cases. Why not trephine the murderer's skull, for instance, and take off a slice from the too active murder-inspiring organ? It may be alledged that this part would be exceedingly dangerous for the application of the trephine; I grant it, but necessity knows no law, and we *are told* that it is sometimes *proper to do evil that good may follow*.

We should, certainly, save a fellow creature from committing a crime upon which the direst punishment is entailed, both in this world and in that which is to come. The man's life might probably be lost—but even supposing that the experiment should fail thus, I will leave it *to you* to decide whether he and his fellow-creatures would not be mutual gainers. His name too, instead of standing on the records of infamy, would be handed down with eulogy to posterity, and, like the noble Roman Curtius, he would be held forth as an example of magnanimity, in having sacrificed his life for his country's welfare.



But it is to be feared that these golden projects (like those of *Real del Montè*) will never be *realized*. I confess I feel surprized they have never been taken into consideration. I will again submit *to you* whether the proposition before mentioned be not worthy of the deepest and most undivided attention, when we consider the multifarious, dire, and devastating effects of this single organ, destructiveness. According to Dr. Spurzheim's own definition which I shall give you verbatim, this sublime organ "gives us the propensity to pinch, scratch, bite, cut, break, pierce, devastate, demolish, ravage, burn, massacre, struggle, butcher, suffocate, hang, drown, kill, poison, murder, and assassinate!" With such a vivid and powerful description of its amiable qualities we can easily conceive the force, beauty and truth of the argument we lately heard advanced, that the over-activeness of this organ was one of the great and primary causes of the decay of nations.

But, as I said before, I fear the opportunity is lost, for Phrenology has passed its zenith of popularity, (except in Edinburgh perhaps) and attained its utmost perfection. Like its twin sister science Physiognomy, (with which Dr. Spurzheim is now propping it up) Phrenology is certainly an amusing and very ingenious speculation, but, like it, has been carried to such preposterous lengths, as to fairly outstep all bounds of credibility, and disgust all who are not complete zealots in the cause.

The first objection I shall urge against the Craniologists is on the ground of their fixing upon the brain as the habitation or seat of the soul, from which it is to dispense its vivifying and mysterious agency over the whole body. They say of the brain, what Lord Byron has so beautifully and figuratively said of the skull, that it is

"The dome of thought, the palace of the soul."

I am perfectly aware that it has been the fashion to assign a seat to the soul, from the earliest ages. Aristotle saw ample reason to choose the heart as its seat; Pythagoras and Plato selected the brain; Van Helmont (like a thorough bred modern gastronome) argued stoutly for the stomach; Des Cartes believed it was enelosed in the pineal gland, and many other celebrated men's opinions might be quoted, the very discrepaney of which would act as a powerful argument against them.

Why should we be so anxious to assign a seat to an immaterial essence of which all agree in confessing no traces have ever been found, be it in heart, brain, stomach, or pineal gland? Could we say with justice that any one part of our beautifully arranged and admirably contrived structure was more perfect than another, or better contrived for the performance of its particular functions, there might be a shadow of an excuse for the custom. But, Gentlemen, as you well know this is not the case, every individual part, be it bone, muscle, ligament, artery, vein, or nerve, is equally perfect and equally adapted to its destined duty. Every portion is alike indebted to the soul for its vitality, and that subtle essence, as far as we know, pervades *equally* the whole frame, as Virgil has so beautifully described,

“ Spiritus intus alit, totamque infusa per artus,  
Mens agitat molem et magno se corpore miscet.”

The Phrenologists stoutly maintain their belief of the immaterial nature of the soul: the oftener they have been attacked as holding opposite tenets, the more violent and abusive have they become. If they really do believe as they say, their system must at once fall to the ground.

The soul being immaterial is invisible and untangible, and the essence of its nature a mystery. The mode of its connection with matter also appeared until now equally unfathomable: the Phrenologists have, however, lately

lifted the veil of nature and ascertained this grand arcanum. They tell us that upon the size of the brain and volume of its organs depend the intellectual capacities of the man. What a tremendous head that Colossus of Literature, Dr. Johnson had, or ought to have had! How admirably expressive—how phrenologically exact is Hood's description of the Irish Schoolmaster.

“ He sitteth lowly on a birenen log,  
 “ Secure in high authority and dread,  
 “ *Large as a dome of learning seems his head!*”

This is making the brain the seat of the soul with a witness—we are to judge of a man's intellect by the magnitude of his skull, as we do of his corporeal strength by the size of his limbs\*!

The mind manifests a plurality of faculties, therefore the brain as its organ must have a plurality of organs, or places of residence for these faculties, and, according to the evolution of the faculty, will be the size of its lodgings. When the tenant is unusually active and powerful, he sets to work, *vi et armis*, and pushes out the brain into a very large organ in making more room in his habitation; when feeble, he wisely knows his own weakness, and even pusillanimously allows some aspiring Buonaparte of an organ to usurp his territories. How is this to be explained? Are we to imagine that the brain and its thirty-three organs constitute mind? or that they are acted upon mechanically by the soul or mind, pushing out their highly sensitive structure, and compelling them to do the same by the skull with an expansive power similar to steam?

This sounds absurd enough, but it is a dilemma, from the horns of which the Phrenologists cannot escape,

\* In this last even we find ourselves frequently deceived, as any one will acknowledge who has been in the fives court, or looked with a professional eye at the figures of the men contending in sculling matches.

but by giving up their science, or avowing themselves honestly and boldly to be materialists.

When we acknowledge the truth of their system, we may as well at the same time return to the notions of the ancient philosophers, who talked of vessels conveying vital spirits—we may scout Harvey, and affirm that the blood flows from the heart by day and returns to it by night, or believe in the efficacy of animal magnetism and metallic tractors. To render the argument of immaterialism into the syllogistic form: Nothing which is immaterial can exert a material power upon a solid substance to change its shape or influence its size. The soul or mind is immaterial, therefore the soul or mind cannot influence the shape or size of the brain. The inference from this is evident, but granting that mind and brain are synonymous terms, I am still inclined to think there are ample grounds for disputation. Mr. Coombe (having probably the organ of music) compares the brain and its thirty-three sprouts or organs to the piano forte; when one string is acted on, a certain sound is produced; when a second is excited, another sound swells on the ear, and so on by analogy with these organs of the brain; in the latter case, however, I suspect there is a great want of the *additional keys*!

These organs of the mental faculties, if they have such power as to effect a change in the shape of solid bone, should at all events be visible by demonstration on the subject. But, unfortunately they are not so, or perhaps they are only visible through the medium of a phrenological microscope. This point, again, I may venture to leave to the decision of any unprejudiced person possessing the power of vision. Here is an excellent engraving\* representing the outer surface of the brain, and its sulci gyrating in all directions, but where are the thirty-three organs, such as we should be led to expect from the lines

\* The engraving here referred to is from the splendid work of Soemmerring.



of demarcation on the plaster cast? I fear they are like Macbeth's dagger, air-drawn phantoms of organs. The Phrenologists will tell you it would be folly to expect to see them, and there I cordially agree with them.

Secondly, The internal surface of the skull is said to present an accurate mould of the external figure of the brain. Judge for yourselves, Gentlemen, where are all the marks in this skull, for instance, of the singular convolutions of the brain? Why are they to be omitted in an accurately formed mould? You may see arborescent sulci, certainly branching beautifully in all directions, but what are they for? the vessels of the dura mater or covering of the brain; and not impressions from the substance of the brain itself; and here we ought to have the mould of thirty-three distinct organs! It would require, to find these impressions, a great exertion of the organs of imaginative-ness, and credulativeness, to use their quaint terms, which, as Butler says, are

“English cut on Greek and Latin,

“Like fustian heretofore on satin!

Thirdly, The two surfaces of the skull, external and internal, are said to correspond exactly—that is, where the one is concave the other will be convex, and vice versa. This I deny. I will here merely select one part of the skull which an honest Phrenologist, in London, confessed to me was really a stumbling block they could not well get over. I refer to certain cavities existing in the frontal bone, termed frontal sinuses. Here is a good specimen, as you will plainly see, a musquet ball might easily knock in a brace of blooming organs, and lodge in this cavity without touching the brain. How can the brain possibly influence the shape of this part, this external table of the bone? It goes to reason that it must destroy this cavity and join the two tables of bone together before it could, by exerting any expansive power, however great, make any difference in the shape of the part. And yet over this cavity we have

organs established beyond all controversy. Here is a specimen of a frontal bone of tolerable thickness—hard work for an organ of the brain to alter its shape. It might form a curious mathematical question to ascertain the requisite degree of expansive power to be used by the brain before it could alter its shape, and form a bump, and whether it could be done without breaking the bone, or it would be necessary to have it previously softened.

Fourthly, It is really painful to have to observe that the pillars and props, the very polar stars of this science, differ among themselves about the uses of certain organs. Thus, for instance, one skilful craniologist states the organ or bump, immediately above the root of the nose, to be that of ideality: a second, says it gives the capacity of being educated or of becoming perfect: a third, that it gives the power of distinguishing individuals or attending to natural history: a fourth affirms that it gives a turn for personification: and a fifth has bothered his bumps until he has discovered that it simply gives the idea of motion! *proh deum atque hominum fides!* At the base of the brain are many unexplored parts—a terra incognita—actually exceeding in the size of its superficies, the upper part on which they have stuck thirty-three organs, and here it is thought highly probable (from many logical inductions) are situated four marvellous organs, by which we are enabled to be hungry or thirsty, hot or cold. We have lately been informed that an Irish professor has discovered two new organs, the organum botheratio and organum blarneyi\*.

Dr. Spurzheim, who is said to be the best and most scientific dissector of the brain in Europe, acknowledged his inability to distinguish any difference between the

\* It is a singular fact that none of these great men have been able to discover an organ of *common sense!*—perhaps it is too dangerous an organ to be encouraged in the face of their *science*. *Credulity*, also, which we are told, is so amazingly prevalent among mankind, has no lodgings—no organ in the brain.

brains of an idiot and a genius. He is also said to have laughed very hard at Porson's skull, because it was amazingly thick. It will be remembered that Dr. Allen told us, it was an established fact that in all clever men the skull is worn very thin and the hair soon falls off, over the active organs. Ergo, Porson was a fool. Therefore, beware ye clever men, ye stars of literature, ye Cannings and Broughams and Scarletts, ye Scotts and Campbells and Moores, hide your huge paper skulls or fence your wigs with triple brass, lest by some hapless chance a blow or fall, or e'en a sportive rap from some young damsel's fan, demolish a full blown organ in the plenitude of its power.

It may not be amiss here to suggest to all schoolmasters, the propriety of driving the learning in (when necessary) by the head's antipodes; (Lord Castlereagh would have termed this a fundamental feature in education)—boxing the ears, as it is termed, might be of very serious consequences, especially to a boy of first-rate genius.

Spurzheim candidly confessed to Abernethy that he was unable to find by the minutest examination any peculiar conformation in the skull of the celebrated calculating boy, George Bidder, of whom doubtless all here have heard, and lo! Mr. Combe asserts that he has the organ of number amazingly developed.

It is related (if I remember aright) by Lavater, that the following singular event took place in Rome, in the 13th century. A number of skulls and bones were discovered in a particular place, from the situation of which it was judged that they had belonged to saints and martyrs; the consequence was they were sold as relics at a most exorbitant price. It was afterwards whispered about, to the utter horror and confusion of the pious purchasers, that the bones had belonged to a troop of banditti. A terrible depreciation in the value of shares immediately took place—all sellers and no buyers. The advice of a skilful phre-

nologist would have been invaluable in such a case, as it is very probable the whole was only a scheme to obtain money from the credulous.

I was informed not long since of a very singular and unique case, which came under the observation of a warm, nay, a very hot, admirer of craniology in this town. A man had the organ of destructiveness strongly developed on *one* side of the head *only*. How was this difficult disposition to be accounted for, and what was to be expected from the man? Nature soon solved the problem, he *half* murdered an unlucky wight who offended him!

Another enthusiast used when studying, to find his bumps get hot in succession, as they were alternately excited by the nature of his enquiries, and if he rode his hobby hard they got into a violent perspiration. Any good phrenologist therefore could at once have detected the nature of his studies, as well as had a thermometer to his diligence and application.

Fifthly, It is a well known fact that in severe injuries of the head, and these not confined to any particular part, that large portions of brain have been lost or removed. The sufferer has afterwards recovered and no perceptible alteration has been observed in the mental faculties. Any one who will take the trouble to refer to the works of Morgagni, Haller, or Abercromby, may find numbers of these cases recorded, where portions of brain have been lost from every part of the skull, either unchanged in texture or by suppuration, without injury to the mental powers of the individuals. Sometimes a fungus will shoot out from the brain and an amazing increase of substance take place, and still the same result be found. Here, there are two exactly opposite cases in which phrenological argument falls to the ground. In the first, where the brain is taken away, the organ ought certainly either to be totally destroyed, or nearly so; and in the other case, its



activity should be exuberantly increased. There are many very curious and unaccountable effects related as proceeding from the injuries of the brain. Sir Astley Cooper mentions one of a foreigner, whose skull was fractured by the kick of a horse; he had acquired a perfect knowledge of the English language, but the first words he spoke after recovering from the shock, were German; he got well, but never could speak English afterwards.

With regard to the size of the head being a criterion of intellect, a gentleman resided in this town, not many years since, who was remarkable for the smallness of his stature and person, and the amazing size of his head; the only particular faculty which he appeared to possess, was that of sleeping, in which he was peculiarly great. But Dr. Gordon, of Edinburgh, has said enough on this head, and like him, I may venture to leave it to the personal experience and candour of my hearers.

Should this, however, unluckily happen to be true, the sooner we return to the use of full-bottomed wigs the better. All may then contrive to pass muster. The phrenological part of the community would also find considerable facility afforded to investigation; and if some few had their organs sketched out with ink on their shaven crowns, it would form a kind of *Gradus ad Parnassum* for the young ones.

The shape of the skull may perhaps give us some little idea of the mental powers, at all events we are ready enough to judge by external appearances. But let us not be too hasty in forming conclusions this way. It has been previously stated that it is the constant custom of some nations to mould the head to a particular shape, to terrify their enemies or distinguish their tribes.

In Mr. Lawrence's lectures, we find two beautiful engravings of Carib skulls,\* one represents the natural, the other

\* Copies of these were here exhibited.

the artificial formation. Both the crania are in London. The latter one was in the possession of the late Mr. Cline, and was presented to him by a surgeon of Tobago. The individual had been a chief of the red Caribs, of St. Vincents, and frequently came to Tobago on business; he was well known there and much esteemed, as an intelligent, well-informed, and prudent character.

Here we have actually no forehead, a facial angle of sixty-six degrees, and an enormous occipital projection, followed by none of the effects which might be reasonably looked for by a phrenologist.

In order to look on man with the discriminating eye of a phrenologist, we must regard all the actions in his busy little career through the varied drama of life, as the result of certain little protuberances in his brain and bumps on his skull. Virtue and vice must alike be viewed as the result of natural formation, and therefore, the former can no longer be held forth as meritorious, or as worthy of imitation; whilst as to the latter, we cannot but regard with compassion, those unfortunate beings, whose preponderating cerebral organs compel them to the commission of crimes. There can no longer be even a shadow of justice in punishing them for deeds even of the deepest dye, because they cannot avoid the decrees of fate.

Were such a doctrine to be once promulgated, who could foresee the consequences? I need scarcely say, they would be dreadful in the extreme, fatal in every respect, to the well-being of society.

When the craniologists can demonstrate distinctly, in the brain, their thirty-three organs of the faculties;—when they can explain *why* there is that precise number of each and *no more*;—when they can prove that the capacity of the intellect actually does depend upon the quantity of the substance of the brain, and tell us *why* it does so;—when they can shew thirty-three visible corresponding concavi-

ties and convexities on the two surfaces of the skull;—when they can philosophically account how the brain, a soft substance, can possess this power they have ascribed to it, of influencing the shape of the hard bony walls which confine and protect it;—when they can shew this, in particular, with respect to the frontal sinuses;—when they can tell us why, when the actual substance of their organs is destroyed, the mental faculty is not impaired;—when they can explain logically their very singular views of the mysterious link of connexion between mind and matter;—and lastly, when they can conscientiously say that their opinions are favourable and beneficial in a moral point of view:—then, and not till then, can I ever think we shall be justified in attaching the slightest credit to their fanciful theory.

It is perhaps but proper to observe, by way of conclusion, that this paper has been somewhat anticipated, by an excellent article in the last *Edinburgh Review*. Mr. Jeffrey has treated the subject with his usual argumentative acuteness, and left little room for any follower in his steps, excepting in the way of playful satire.

“Non ego mordaci distrinxi carmine quenquam  
Nulla venenata est litera mista joco.”

ALSO, BY THE SAME AUTHOR,

OBSERVATIONS on the HUMAN STRUCTURE.

PRICE ONE SHILLING.

AN ESSAY on a NEW MEMBRANE in the EYE.

PRICE ONE SHILLING.

NICHOLAS WALKER, a Comic POEM.

PRICE ONE SHILLING.